



Raphael



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
Getty Research Institute

<https://archive.org/details/hrhprincealberta00moor>

H. R. H. PRINCE ALBERT

AND THE

APOLLO AND MARSYAS

BY

RAPHAEL

H. R. H. PRINCE ALBERT
AND THE
APOLLO AND MARSYAS
BY RAPHAEL

TO THE PUBLIC

A STATEMENT WITH AN APPENDIX

BY MORRIS MOORE

SECONDE ÉDITION

AUGMENTÉE DE LA

Traduction Française de « A STATEMENT »

PARIS

IMPRIMERIE ET LITHOGRAPHIE DE RENOU ET MAULDE
RUE DE RIVOLI, 144.

1850

CONTENTS

TO THE PUBLIC

	Pages.
A STATEMENT	5 to 17
POSTSCRIPT	17 to 22
TRADUCTION FRANÇAISE DE « A STATEMENT ».....	23 to 36

APPENDIX

THE CORRIERE ITALIANO AND MONITORE TOSCANO.....	38 to 52
LETTER OF LORD ELCHO	53 to 54
THE REJECTED MICHAEL ANGELO.....	55 to 61

TO THE PUBLIC

A STATEMENT

Paris, 1859.

The subornation of the Director of the Venetian Academy to secrete the original drawing for the picture by Raphael in my possession, the *Apollo and Marsyas*, a deed now notorious to Europe, and identified with a question formally on the 20th of March, 1850, and again, on the 25th of March, 1859, brought under the notice of the House of Commons, has had a consonant sequel (1).

Early in March, having heard that a collection of photographs, published by Bardi the printseller of Florence, from Raphael's Drawings at Florence, Venice, and Vienna, had reached Paris, I called upon the depositary, and requested permission to see it. He handed me the three series with a printed Italian catalogue descriptive of each piece. To the *Second Series*, namely, the Venetian, was this note :

" For the nomenclature of these Drawings and for the relative observations, we have availed ourselves of J. D. Passavant's Work, *Rafael von Urbino*, etc., Leipsie, 1839; and of

(1) See *Corriere Italiano*, etc., *Appendix*, page 38 to 49.

“ the Marchese P. Selvatico’s Catalogue , published at Venice
“ in 1854. — The photographs of the Drawings in this series,
“ are all of the same size as the originals ” (1).

We have here a formal intimation that either in Passavant or in Selvatico is to be found whatever appears under this head, and that, unless otherwise stated, they express no disagreement ; for in the face of such an announcement, to suppress a notable discrepancy between them would be a suspicious omission of a manifest obligation, while silence on an intercalation contradictory of either, especially if anonymous, would warrant the worst construction.

Last on its list, the very arrangement to catch the eye, picked out from several obvious counterfeits, *as the only possible counterfeit*, and so, though to the letter prudentially retained in the Raphael category, in spirit expelled from it, I found Raphael’s most salient drawing of the Venetian series, heralded as follows :

“ 80. APOLLO AND MARSYAS, a drawing in pen and water-
“ colour on reddish paper ; this drawing is by some attributed
“ to Mantegna ” (2).

Mark, not *Montagna*, the name written below it on the mounting, as the photograph which I procured of it at

(1) “ Per la nomenclatura di questi Disegni e per le relative osservazioni, ci siamo serviti dell’ Opera di J. D. Passavant, *Rafael von Urbino*, Lipsia, 1839; e del Catalogo del Marchese P. Selvatico, pubblicato a Venezia nel 1854. — Le fotografie dei Disegni di questa serie sono tutte della medesima grandezza degli originali. ”

(2) “ 80. APOLLO E MARSIA, disegno a penna e acquerello su carta rossastra ; questo disegno vien da qualcheduno attribuito al *Mantegna*. ”

Venice, in 1857, shews,—but *Mantegna*. I saw here the cloven foot. This drawing never was attributed to Mantegna. The Selvatico Catalogue describes it thus :

“APOLLO AND MARSYAS. A work of rare perfection, in which Raphael shews all his elegance. This drawing, once attributed to Bart. Montagna, I know not why, has been ascertained to be undoubtedly by Raphael” (1).

The name *Montagna* was written by Count Cicognara, formerly President of the Venetian Academy, as a memorandum, when sorting the collection, that Benedetto Montagna had engraved the same subject; an explanation given me at Venice, in 1857, by the actual subdirector of that Academy, Signor Andrea Tagliapietra, present when Cicognara wrote it, and confirmed to me by Signor Francesco Zanotto, secretary to the Venetian Academy under Cicognara’s Presidency.

The Marchese P. Selvatico then, one of the authorities

(1) The entire passage, page 40, is as follows :

“ * 7. APOLLO E MARSIA. — Disegno all’ acquerello rialzato di biacca.
— Opera di rara perfezione, in cui Raffaello mostra tutta la sua eleganza.
— Questo disegno, attribuito da prima a Bart. Montagna, nè so il perchè,
fu riconosciuto essere indubbiamente di Raffaello. Il sig. Moore a Londra
ha un dipinto tenuto del Sanzio, colla stessa composizione, ed un poco
più piccolo del disegno presente.” — The asterisk corresponds to a
notice at page 13, that this sign distinguishes the most valuable drawings;
— “ N. B. I disegni più pregevoli sono contrassegnati da un asterisco.”

In the above passage there are three errors : 1. This drawing is executed chiefly with the silver point, water-colour being confined to the high lights and extreme shadows; 2. The name written by Cicognara on the mounting, is “*Benedº*” (Benedetto), not “*Bart.*” (Bartolomeo) Montagna; 3. The picture instead of being a little smaller than the drawing, is, on the contrary, larger by nearly three inches in height, and by one inch in breadth. The difference is between the backgrounds. The figures are precisely of the same dimension.

to whom we are bid look for the nomenclature of the Venetian series, says nothing of Mantegna, nor in any way questions the *Apollo and Marsyas* drawing : on the contrary, he piles emphasis on panegyric in maintaining it to be by *Raphael*; cannot even *conceire* a doubt of it; and proclaims a like conviction for others. Neither has Passavant, the remaining authority, ever attributed it to Mantegna. Therefore the Public is misled by the note to the Venetian series ; a proceeding which shall presently be stripped to its uttermost nakedness. But first, a word more upon Passavant.

“ At pages 174–5 of the third and last volume of his *Rafael von Urbino und sein Vater Giovanni Santi*, published at Leipsic in July, 1858, and under the special head, APOLLO AND MARSYAS, it is his “ *conviction* that both the drawing and the picture after it are by *Timoteo Viti* ”; and this “ *conviction* ” he declares while owning to have not seen the former since 1835, — *since twenty-three years*. Now, mark further his *conviction*.

Reflecting that had he previously known of the Venetian Academy’s possessing the original drawing by “ Timoteo Viti ”, as he styles him, he would scarcely in 1850, even dull as he is, have committed himself with Lord Elcho, and, before Mr Böhm, with me, to an “ *unalterable opinion* ” that the picture was by *Francesco Francia* (1), I went to the *Bibliothèque Impériale*, and there examined the part of his Work cited in the note to the Venetian photographs; namely, the two first volumes,

(1) See Lord Elcho’s Letter, *Appendix*, page 53; and M. Böhm’s, *Morning Post*, June the 13th, 1859.

published in 1839. In the second volume, page 466, was a Division, “Raphael’s Drawings in Italy”; first under it, the subdivision, “Raphael’s Drawings in the Academy of Fine Arts at Venice”; *nowhere a word about the Apollo and Marsyas*. But his hero was Raphael, not Timoteo della Vite. To objection so imperious, a swift reply.—In this self-same subdivision, page 477, figures not the *only* one by another hand, “a pen drawing of Mary with the Infant Christ standing”, by his very *Timoteo Viti*.—Silence therefore upon a drawing so exquisite, so *striking*, as the *Apollo and Marsyas*, and *by this same master*; as he would impose, were of itself the guage of his perception in 1835, and of his *scrupulousness* in 1858; but his earliest mention of it occurring in an attack upon me in the *Deutsches Kunstblatt* of Berlin on the 1st of November, 1855, that is, *five years and nine months after the discovery of the picture*, the evidence superabounds that if he saw the drawing in 1835, he did not observe it; nay, that he remained unconscious of its very existence until full fifteen years later its obscurity became irradiated by the rising splendour of the former; consequently, that his “conviction” of 1858 is *a conviction for the occasion*. So exquisite is the fibre of “eminent” Germans, *By Authority* “more eligible than Englishmen”!

A few days after I had seen the photographs above-mentioned, an acquaintance wishing to purchase some of them, called upon me with a complete set, that I might assist him in the selection. I asked him whether he had noticed what the catalogue said of the *Apollo*

and Marsyas. — “ I did notice it, he replied, and was struck by it : whence that name *Mantegna* ? — *That*, I rejoined, *is the mark of Prince Albert*. — After a pause, he said ; — “ You are right ! I come straight from Bardi : he himself lent me the set which you see here, and informed me that Prince Albert had procured him the authorizations for the execution of the Work, and that it was got up under his patronage and *superintendence*. Bardi is at the Hôtel Byron, rue Laffitte ” — Until now I was not aware that Bardi was in Paris. *Self-defence* then, not to mention higher motives, impelled me to fathom this new perfidy.

Taking with me Selvatico’s Catalogue, I called at the Hôtel Byron. It was *Mardi Gras*, the 8th of March. Bardi was at home, and, as it was a holiday, at leisure. I requested to see his photographs. As he required no name, I gave none. He had deferred his return to Florence expressly to superintend the first issue of his Publication here, and was therefore anxious to shew it and to satisfy inquiries. I began at the *First Series*, the Florentine, examined each piece, and pointed out sundry errors in the catalogue. He thanked me for my corrections, and eagerly jotted them down. On reaching the *Second Series*, I read the note aloud, and remarked that to parade in an Italian Work a German name exploded even in Germany, was a slur upon Italy, and that either country could have afforded him authority more respectable than Passavant ; an individual, insignificant as a Critic, and untrustworthy as a man. — “ Oh ! said he, that is no fault of mine. I am no connoisseur. It was Prince

Albert who obtained from the Austrian and Tuscan governments leave to execute these photographs. For the Drawings at Vienna and at Venice, he gave me a letter to the Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian, to whom I presented it myself at Schönbrunn, and he commanded me through his German secretary, Dr Becker, to confine myself to Selvatico and Passavant in compiling the catalogue; but to always first consult Passavant, whom he considers the highest of authorities. The Work is brought out under Prince Albert's Patronage and is dedicated to him. I am merely the publisher, and am but recently arrived from Londón, whither I went to submit it to him completed". — Then I presume that this catalogue was reviewed by Prince Albert before publication. — " *It was*".

I now came to N° 80, the *Apollo and Marsyas*. — Another error! said I. This drawing is executed chiefly with the silver point, not with the pen, as you state. But how is this? " *By some attributed to Mantegna*"! It never was attributed to Mantegna. Here is your Marchese P. Selvatico's Catalogue. Observe; he declares it " a work of rare perfection, *in which Raphael shews all his elegance*", and " *ascertained to be undoubtedly by Raphael*"⁽¹⁾. Nor does Passavant speak of Mantegna. How

(1) The expression "di rara perfezione" which Selvatico applies to the *Apollo and Marsyas* drawing, occurs, though with far less reason, elsewhere in his catalogue, as also the analogous phrases, " di rara bellezza", " bel disegno franchissimo, etc.". These are " *by Permission*" all duly rendered in English by; " of singular beauty", " beautiful", " a fine and very bold drawing, etc." But the panegyric on the *Apollo and Marsyas* drawing, " *Opera di rara perfezione in cui Ros-*

came this name then? — Bardi now admitted that he was familiar with Selvatico's Catalogue, and knew that neither there, nor in Passavant, was Mantegna mentioned. But to this drawing, he said, there was a singular history, the details of which he had heard at Venice. It was the drawing for the picture belonging to Mr Morris Moore, to whom Prince Albert was extremely hostile, and who had, in consequence, so suffered in England, that he had been driven from the country. At an interview which he, Bardi, had had with Prince Albert, the latter had vehemently repudiated both the drawing and — without ever having *seen* it — the *picture*, as *not by Raphael*. The anonymous interpolation about *Mantegna* had been inserted *by Prince Albert's express command*. Nor am I the only one in Paris to whom Bardi has related these particulars. But what need of witnesses? There lies the *corpus delicti*, — the falsehood in the catalogue, and the *Dedication*. Before leaving, I obtained two ver-

faello mostra tutta la sua eleganza, " not being included in the Royal Patent, *it is suppressed*.

Where *all* breathes candour, every utterance is precious. The Venetian series is singled out, as we have seen at page 6, text and note, for the announcement that " the photographs of the Drawings in this series are *all of the same size as the originals*." Now, the figures in the *Apollo and Marsyas* drawing are exactly of the same size as those in the picture, and an indentation around the outlines of the former shews that they were transferred by the tracing point to the latter. The Publication " Dedicated *by Permission, etc.*," disposes of such connection between the two works by frankly giving, under cover of the preceding announcement, a photograph of this drawing so reduced as to represent the *Apollo as shorter by an inch and three quarters* — by the head and neck — *than the original*. Thus, at worst, the *Patron* can fall back upon the satisfaction of at least having *proved* that this drawing never could have served for the *actual* outlines of the figures in the picture.

sions of the catalogue, one in Italian, the other in English, “ Dedicated by Permission to H. R. H. the Prince Consort ”.

Thrift follows fawning. We shall be told that as the Publication is Prince Albert’s *own*, he may deal with it according to his humour ; that he also, as well as another, must have liberty to express an opinion, and that the interpolation needs no other apology. The first postulate transcends reply : the last is less intangible. Let *every* man have liberty to express himself freely on *all* matters ; and conscience be the *only* bar to license. But, under a mask to insinuate into a public document a malignant assertion, as devoid of conviction as of truth, detrimental to your neighbour, and, constructively, as the respectable judgment of staid authority, — an interpretation I defy Casuistry itself to rebut, — is an expansion of the principle scarcely reconcilable with any received system of Ethics. The passing over of Passavant’s silence, the surreptitious interpolation of a flat contradiction to Selvatico’s declaration, and the utter suppression of the latter, are a fit corollary to the *class of argument* let loose upon me to vindicate the superlative “ qualifications ” of that “ able hand ”⁽¹⁾, the *twice-expelled* and *self-*

(1) See Prince Albert’s Appendix to the Report of the Parliamentary Committee of 1853 on the National Gallery (No. XVII, p. 791), and Letter to Lord Ellesmere on the Manchester Exhibition, London Journals, July, 1856.

It is expedient it be distinctly understood that the “ able hand ” in the text saw the *Apollo and Marsyas* when on view for sale in 1850 at Christie’s. Four of my acquaintance, witnesses of this circumstance, have repeatedly stated it to me and to others. One of them, Mr. J. W. Brett of Hanover Square, even *pointed out* the *Apollo and Marsyas* to him

confessed incompetent functionary, Eastlake, — *Le Chevalier*, as he styles himself, — and to protect this “amiable, distinguished, and thorough gentleman” from being “a butt for the attacks of every disappointed competitor”.

On reaching home, I made a memorandum of what had passed at Bardii’s, and examined the version “Dedicated by Permission, etc.” This began with the Venetian series. The note was the same, but at N° 80 I discovered an addition :

“ 80. APOLLO AND MARSYAS : drawn with the pen and shaded with Indian ink. This drawing has been ascribed to Mantegna; it corresponds with the picture now in the possession of Mr Morris Moore”.

Why halt? why flinch from proclaiming that in 1850, the auctioneer catalogued the *picture* also as *Mantegna*?

as a remarkable work. The “able hand” looked at it, uttered something about “curious,” — and passed on. This further expounds the subsequent plots against picture and drawing. Linked as these works are with the good name of one who has borne his share in twice ousting the client from the National Gallery, the “able hand” and his Patron have obviously an *interest* in undermining both.

Again, it was this same “able hand” that in 1845 appraised at £ 630, and *bought* for this sum, the supposititious Holbein, “a *Medical Gentleman*,” as he terms it, and who in the same breath rejected at £ 500, Mrs. Bonar’s (now Mr. Labouchere’s) unfinished picture in tempera, *The Virgin and Child with St. John and Saints*, by Michael Angelo; a *mistake* which I made a chief point of my indictment against him before the Parliamentary Committee of 1853 (q. 9953) on the National Gallery.

Thus, before the eyes of this twice fraudulently reinstated Chief of a National Gallery, of this President of a Royal Academy, have passed, nay, have as it were been thrust upon him, two of the rarest and most exquisite specimens of the REVIVAL; but he for them was sightless, they for him were a blank; a strange yet authentic epitome of his official career. — See “THE REJECTED MICHAEL ANGELO”, *Appendix*, page 55.

The ascription of the *drawing* to Mantegna, in 1859, was to signalise *a coincidence*. Why leave inchoate so infinite a conclusion against “ the picture now in the possession of Mr Morris Moore ”? But when was fraud not craven! To have quoted *loyally* Cicognara’s memorandum had carried its own antidote; since Benedetto Montagna’s quaint little print of *Apollo and Marsyas* with Apollo in blouse playing the fiddle, may be seen in any considerable collection of engravings, and “ corresponds ” neither with the auction-room catalogue of 1850, nor “ *with the picture now in the possession of Mr Morris Moore.* ” From first to last, and in every sense, the interpolation is a cheat. Not a decent name can be produced to give it countenance. I anticipate the apology for the English *rider*. The *printer* will be the culprit. An *a* for an *o*, and an *e* for an *a*, and lo! Cicognara’s Benedetto Montagna *unwittingly* Andrea Mantegna, the name for a moment connected with the picture. Behold the coincidence ! Meanwhile, like a “ *creeping venom’d thing* ”, the forgery winds through Europe; and so, in the nice computation of chances, the hope ferments that the venom may leave a sting (1).

It is nine years that this conspiracy, fed by every turpitude, is afoot. Blinded by ignorance and vicious instinct, the conspirators hailed in the *Apollo and Marsyas*

(1) It is my resolve, since in England fairplay seems extinct, to circulate throughout Europe, in various languages, every incident, and to post the name of every abettor, of this opprobrious conspiracy. It is one Dr. Radford, of Suffolk Street, Pall Mall, London, who “ from pure love of Art,” as he gives out, has lent himself as “ honorary ” translator and Amender-Licentiate of Prince Albert’s catalogue.

an opportunity. It might remit all transgressions. My judgment at fault here, the verdict which twice I had established against them would be reversed; a scandalous reinstatement vindicated. A trim prospect through a dull argument. They went to work; but, mole-like, underground. When I bent myself to unearth them, an obsequious freemasonry, in deference to a foreigner whom nevertheless privately all vituperate, dammed up every channel of publicity, choked utterance where once my voice was sought and approved. Such the return for best years and energies devoted to the Public; such the *consequence* to that array of testimonials which, in the teeth of sycophancy, I had won from the press and men not deaf to conscience; and to that yet more dainty blazon, confessions wrung from enemies. But “ truth is truth to the end of reckoning.” I bethought me that England was not the *World*, shook off the dust under my feet, and appealed to Europe. The new verdict has more than ratified the old.

In *me*, personality is a demerit to outweigh argument and unrealise fact. Still, personal I must continue until I shall have learned that measures can have birth without man; an act without an agent; fraud without a knave. But, thank Providence! I feel that within, which must ever preserve me from indulging *in personality such as is here proved*. Not a man in the English Parliament, where even the slenderest pretext for clamour about “ National honour ” is wont to be seized upon as a trump card, has ever hazarded a breath about my arrest in Berlin, a breath about that insolent violation of Inter-

national Law, my expulsion from Prussia in defiance of the most conclusive of admissions by the Prussian government that nothing existed to justify either outrage. But “out of this silence can be read as much, as from the rattling tongue of saucy and audacious eloquence”,— and “*instinct is a great matter*”. The Berlin piece stood awhile for repetition in Paris; but the german sympathies of a German Court were wanting to its revival ⁽¹⁾.

How many Englishmen will venture to utter *openly* what even the vilest *must feel* on perusal of this? Where wrong such as I have endured may pass unchallenged, Civism is but a sound; Liberty, a phantom. What more can the fiercest Despotism, than — strangle? Liberty! — in England, Sycophancy is her vampire. Let any Englishman, “freeborn” as we have it, dare as much! — my experience awaits him. In meanness alone is security.

MORRIS MOORE.

POSTSCRIPT

The new episode in the plot against me concerning the *Apollo and Marsyas* drawing, has met with signal rebuke and discomfiture in Paris. The French are fastidious. They roundly stigmatise it “*une infamie.*” Its

(1) It is notorious at Berlin that the order for my arrest issued *directly from the King's Cabinet*, and that the President of Police was ignorant of the project until the outrage had been perpetrated.

only soil now is England. There, amid servile laughter at schoolboy inanities about “*hypotheses*” and “*contingencies*,” drawled out in reply to a plain question, and scoffs more servile still at the “*famous* picture now in the possession of Morris Moore — *Esquire*,” (1) experience tells me it may thrive; but pointless vulgarity will not prevent that same “*famous* picture” from shining as famous truly, even among pictures truly famous, long after the “*famous*” *author*, “*famous*” *orator of others’ oratory*, and “*famous*” *statesman* of oriental azure-blood, Disraeli-Benjamin-The-Right-Honourable, shall have strutted, with a congenial mob, into a merciful oblivion (2).

I said that fraud was craven. The plotters have slunk from their handiwork. Prince Albert’s catalogue, significantly chastened, has been published in French. The “Dedicated by Permission, etc.,” is, by “Permission,” vanished, — by “Permission” *dis*-Dedicated; vanished too, by “Permission,” are Passavant and Selvatico. Their names are of little recommendation here. The note which contained them is curtailed to the misrepresentation, that “the photographs from the Drawings in this series are all of the same size as the originals,” —

(1) See Mr. Disraeli’s reply to Mr. Coningham. — *Parliamentary Debates*, March the 25th, 1859.

(2) The instinct with which this personage scents old trappings and tricks them out as new, at once reveals the frankness of his nature and the value of his resources, and stamps the Patriarchal antiquity of his pedigree. — *Compare M. Thiers’s Panegyric on Marshal Bugeaud, and ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer Disraeli’s, on the Duke of Wellington.*

b baggage possibly overlooked in the tumult of retreat. But there is further expurgation.

“ On account of the frequent expostulations addressed to him here on the subject,” affirms M. Bardi, but perhaps not less *on account of a dearth of sponsors*, the *Apollo and Marsyas* drawing is, by “ Permission,” no longer “ by some attributed to Mantegna,” but like its companions, triumphs by “ Permission,” as *Raphael*, with the adjunct of the now amiable notification that “ it corresponds with the picture in the possession of Mr. Morris Moore.”

I subjoin a letter, the complement to this STATEMENT, and voucher for my claims as a Prophet.

“ Paris, May the 7th, 1859.

“ My dear Mr. Moore,

“ I went this morning to M. Bardi, to return him the “ photographs which I had discarded from the selection I had “ made amongst the three collections after the drawings by “ Raphael in the Galleries of Florence, Venice, and Vienna. “ I took of him, at the same time, the set from the Cartoons at “ Hampton Court. You know that the day before yesterday “ I made at Bardi’s a first choice, having before me the Italian “ catalogue of those collections. On coming to the *Apollo and Marsyas*, thrown at the end of the Venetian series, I mani- “ fested my astonishment at seeing a first-rate drawing by “ Raphael, and of the most Raphaelesque, given to Mantegna, “ and I asked him who was the author of this curious attribu- “ tion.—“Prince Albert,” he laconically replied.—You know “ that M. Bardi speaks French with difficulty, and besides,

“ he was but slightly acquainted with me. I wished to have
“ some particulars upon so singular a circumstance; although,
“ indeed, what could surprise one after your incredible arrest
“ at Berlin, and the strange letters which followed you hither
“ from London, recommending that an eye be kept on the
“ man, and no support given to the picture? I accordingly put
“ some fresh questions to M. Bardi; but with me he was less
“ communicative than with you and with others, to whom he
“ related this history in all its details. This morning I return-
“ ed to the charge. M. Bardi now told me that this attribu-
“ tion had been taken from an old catalogue of the Venetian
“ Academy, in which the drawing of *Apollo and Marsyas* is
“ given to *Montagna*, and that here, in the Italian catalogue
“ of the photographic collection, *Mantegna* was a *mispaint*
“ for *Montagna*. I contained my indignation at such a shuffle,
“ but admiring the while your perspicacity. M. Bardi was evi-
“ dently rehearsing his lesson. I objected that the Venetian
“ Academy had never had a catalogue before that of M. Sel-
“ vatico, published on the 31st. of July, 1854, which gives
“ this drawing to Raphael, and describes it as one of the
“ most precious of the collection; “ *a work of rare perfec-*
“ *tion, in which Raphael shews all his elegance*”. M. Bardi
“ admitted to me that in fact there never had existed a
“ catalogue before that of M. Selvatico, and put to the push,
“ he ended by declaring that Prince Albert was *certain*, and
“ *maintained*, that this drawing was not by Raphael. I had
“ it on my tongue to ask him upon what knowledge this
“ Monsieur could found a *certainty* of this kind, and *maintain*
“ that a drawing could or could not be by this or that master,
“ and whether then he had an *interest* in fastening so
“ stubbornly upon the *palpable and recognised* attribution
“ of this one, when others in the same collection were
“ ridiculously decked with the names of Raphael, Michael

“ Angelo, Leonardo, Giorgione, etc., without his finding fault,
“ that is, admitting him to be able to detect it; but you
“ will allow that the question was a difficult one to put to a
“ client of the Prince. M. Bardi relieved me of the embar-
“ rassment by telling me of his own accord, that a Mr Morris
“ Moore, very well known, possessed the picture of this
“ drawing, and that since some time this M. Morris Moore
“ had been harassed (*inquiétude*) by the Prince. He added that,
“ on the other hand, so many expostulations had been ad-
“ dressed to him here upon the attribution of this drawing,
“ that he had just had printed a French version of the cata-
“ logue, from which he had caused the name of *Mantegna*
“ to disappear. I send you, my dear Mr. Moore, a copy of
“ this French version. As to this letter, you can make such
“ use of it as you may please.

“ Yours, etc.

“ LÉON BATTÉ”.

• Paris, 7 Mai 1859.

• Mon cher Monsieur Moore,

• Je suis allé ce matin chez M. Bardi pour lui rendre les photographies
• que j'ai écartées dans le choix que j'ai fait parmi ses trois collections
• d'après les dessins de Raphaël dans les galeries de Florence, Venise et
• Vienne. Je lui ai pris en même temps la suite des cartons d'Hampton-
• Court. Vous savez qu'avant-hier je fis un premier choix chez lui, ayant
• sous les yeux le catalogue italien de ces collections. Arrivé à l'*Apollon et*
• *Marsyas*, rejeté à la fin de la série de Venise, je lui manifestai mon éton-
• nement de voir un dessin capital de Raphaël, et des plus raphaëlesques,
• donné à *Mantegna*, et lui demandai quel était l'auteur de cette curieuse
• attribution. — « *Le prince Albert* », me répondit-il laconiquement. —
• Vous savez que M. Bardi parle difficilement français, et il me connaît-
• sait à peine. Je voulus avoir quelques détails sur un fait aussi singulier;
• quoique, en vérité, de quoi s'étonnerait-on après votre incroyable arres-
• tation à Berlin, et les étranges lettres qui de Londres vous suivirent ici,
• lesquelles recommandaient d'avoir les yeux sur l'homme et de n'appuyer

» pas le tableau? Je posai donc à M. Bardi de nouvelles questions; mais il
» fut avec moi moins communicatif qu'avec vous et d'autres, à qui il a
» raconté cette histoire dans tous ses détails. Ce matin je suis revenu à la
» charge. M. Bardi me dit alors qu'on avait pris cette attribution sur un
» ancien catalogue de l'Académie de Venise, où le dessin d'*Apollon et*
» *Marsyas* est donné à *Montagna*, et qu'ici, dans le catalogue italien de la
» collection photographique, *Mantegna* était une *faute d'impression* pour
» *Montagna*. Je contins mon indignation d'une pareille supercherie, tout en
» admirant votre perspicacité. Evidemment M. Bardi me récitait sa
» leçon. Je lui objectai que jamais l'Académie de Venise n'avait eu de
» catalogue antérieur à celui de M. Selvatico, publié le 31 juillet 1854,
» lequel catalogue donne ce dessin à Raphaël, et le désigne comme un
» des plus précieux de la collection, « une œuvre d'une rare perfection
» dans laquelle Raphaël montre toute son élégance. » M. Bardi convint
» avec moi qu'en effet il n'avait jamais existé de catalogue antérieurement
» à celui de M. Selvatico, et, poussé à l'out, finit par me déclarer que le
» prince Albert était certain et soutenait que ce dessin n'était pas de
» Raphaël. J'avais sur la langue de lui demander sur quelles connaissances
» ce monsieur pouvait baser une certitude de ce genre, et soutenir qu'un
» dessin pouvait être ou non d'un maître ou d'un autre, et s'il avait donc
» un intérêt à s'acharner sur l'attribution palpable et reconnue de celui-ci,
» lorsque d'autres, dans la même collection, se paraient ridiculement
» des noms de Raphaël, Michel-Ange, Léonard, Giorgion, etc., sans qu'il
» le trouvât mauvais, en admettant qu'il le reconnaît; mais vous convien-
» drez que la question était difficile à poser à un client du prince. M. Bardi
» m'en évita l'embarras, en me racontant de lui-même qu'un M. Morris
» Moore, très connu, possédait la peinture de ce dessin, lequel M. Morris
» Moore était inquiété (sic) depuis longtemps par le prince. Il ajouta que
» d'ailleurs on lui avait fait ici tant de réclamations au sujet de l'attri-
» bution de ce dessin, qu'il venait de faire imprimer une version française
» de son catalogue, dans laquelle il avait fait disparaître le nom de *Man-*
» *tegna*. Je vous envoie, mon cher M. Moore, un exemplaire de cette ver-
» sion française. Quant à cette lettre, vous en pouvez faire tel usage que
» vous voudrez.

» Votre tout dévoué,

» LÉON BATTÉ.

AU PUBLIC

UN EXPOSÉ

Traduction de « A STATEMENT »

(Voir le texte, page 5)

Un fait aujourd'hui connu de l'Europe, et qui s'identifie à une question formellement portée deux fois devant la Chambre des Communes, le 20 mars 1850 et 25 mars 1859, la subornation du directeur de l'Académie de Venise pour cacher le dessin original du tableau de Raphaël en ma possession, l'*Apollon et Marsyas*, vient d'avoir une digne suite (1).

Dans les premiers jours de mars, ayant appris qu'une collection de photographies publiée par M. Bardì, l'éditeur de Florence, d'après les dessins de Raphaël à Florence, Venise et Vienne, était arrivée à Paris, j'allai chez le dépositaire, et demandai à la voir. On me mit en main les trois séries avec un catalogue italien imprimé décrivant chaque pièce. A la *Seconde Série*, celle de Venise, était cette note :

(1) Voir le *Corriere Italiano*, etc., *Appendice*, page 38 à 49.

« Pour la nomenclature et les observations relatives à ces dessins, nous nous sommes servi de l'ouvrage de M. J. D. Passavant, *Rafael von Urbino*, etc., Leipsic 1839, et du Catalogue du marquis P. Selvatico, publié à Venise en 1854.

« — Les photographies des dessins de cette série sont toutes de la même grandeur que les originaux (1). »

On nous intime expressément ici que, soit dans M. Passavant, soit dans M. Selvatico, devra se trouver tout ce qui se rattache à cette série, et aussi que tous deux sont d'accord lorsqu'on ne nous prévient pas du contraire; car, en face d'une telle annonce, supprimer une différence notable entre eux constituerait une suspecte omission d'un devoir évident, et garder le silence sur une intercalation qui contredirait l'un ou l'autre, surtout si cette intercalation était anonyme, autoriserait la pire interprétation.

Dernier sur la liste, la vraie place pour capter l'œil, trillé parmi des contrefaçons manifestes, *comme la seule contrefaçon possible*, et ainsi, quoique à la lettre prudemment retenu dans la catégorie de Raphaël, en esprit rejeté de cette catégorie, je trouvai le dessin de Raphaël le plus saillant de la série de Venise annoncé comme suit :

« 80. APOLLON ET MARSYAS, dessin à la plume et à l'aquarelle sur papier rosâtre; ce dessin est par quelques-uns attribué à Mantegna (2). »

Remarquez, non pas *Montagna*, le nom écrit sur la monture au-dessous du dessin, comme le montre la photographie que j'en ai fait prendre à Venise en 1857, — mais *Mantegna*. Là je vis le pied fourchu. Ce dessin n'a

(1) Voir pour le texte, page 6, note 1.

(2) Voir pour le texte, page 6, note 2.

jamais été attribué à Mantegna. Le Catalogue Selvatico le décrit ainsi :

« APOLLON ET MARSYAS. Œuvre de rare perfection, dans laquelle Raphaël montre toute son élégance. Ce dessin attribué d'abord, je ne sais pourquoi, à Bart. Montagna, a été reconnu être indubitablement de Raphaël (1). »

Le nom de *Montagna* fut écrit par le comte Cicognara, autrefois président de l'Académie de Venise, comme un memorandum, tandis qu'il classait la collection, que Benedetto Montagna avait gravé le même sujet : explication qui me fut donnée à Venise en 1857 par le sous-directeur actuel de l'Académie, M. Andrea Tagliapietra, présent quand Cicognara l'écrivit, et qui me fut confirmée par M. Francesco Zanotto, secrétaire de l'Académie de Venise sous la présidence de Cicognara.

Or, le marquis P. Selvatico, une des autorités auxquelles on nous renvoie pour la nomenclature de la série de Venise, ne dit rien de Mantegna, ni ne conteste en aucune façon le dessin d'*Apollon et Marsyas*; au contraire, il entasse les éloges en soutenant qu'il est de *Raphaël*, ne peut même *concevoir* un doute à cet égard, et proclame une conviction semblable chez d'autres. M. Passavant non plus, l'autorité qui reste, ne l'a jamais attribué à Mantegna. Donc le Public est égaré par la note à la série de Venise, procédé qui va être dépouillé jusqu'à complète nudité. Mais d'abord un mot de plus sur M. Passavant.

Pages 174-5 du troisième et dernier volume de son *Rafael von Urbino und Sein Vater Giovanni Santi*,

(1) Le nom écrit au-dessous du dessin par le comte Cicognara, est « Bened. » (Benedetto), et non « Bart. » (Bartolommeo) Montagna. — Voir la note, page 7.

publié à Leipsic en juillet 1858, au chapitre spécial APOLLON ET MARSYAS, c'est sa « *conviction* que le dessin et le tableau d'après le dessin sont tous deux de Timoteo Viti; » et cette « *conviction* » il la publie tout en avouant n'avoir pas vu le dessin depuis 1835, — *depuis vingt-trois ans*. Examinons de plus près *sa conviction*.

Réfléchissant que s'il eût préalablement connu le dessin original de « *Timoteo Viti* », comme il l'appelle, possédé par l'Académie de Venise, il était à peine croyable, même borné comme il est, qu'il eût risqué en 1850 devant lord Elcho, et, en présence de M. Böhm, devant moi, son « *opinion inaltérable* » que le tableau était de Francesco Francia (1), j'allai à la Bibliothèque Impériale, et là, compulsai la partie de son ouvrage citée dans la note aux photographies de la série de Venise, c'est-à-dire, les deux premiers volumes publiés en 1839. Dans le second volume, page 466, est une division, « Les Dessins de Raphaël en Italie », et à celle-ci une première subdivision, « Les Dessins de Raphaël dans l'Académie des Beaux-Arts à Venise »; *nette part un mot de l'Apollon et Marsyas*. — Mais son sujet était Raphaël, et non Timoteo della Vite. — A une objection si impérieuse, une courte réponse. — Dans la même subdivision, page 477, figure, et pas le seul étranger à Raphaël, « un dessin à la plume de Marie avec le Christ-Enfant debout », par son véritable *Timoteo Viti*. — Son silence donc sur un dessin aussi exquis, aussi *frappant* que l'*Apollon et Marsyas*, et *par ce même Timoteo Viti*, ce qu'il veut faire croire, serait le

(1) Voir la Lettre de lord Elcho, *Appendice*, page 53, et celle de M. Bohm, *Morning Post*, 13 juin 1850.

gage de sa perception en 1835, et de sa *loyauté* en 1858 ; mais sa première mention du dessin concordant avec une attaque contre moi dans le *Deutsches Kunstblatt* de Berlin, du 1^{er} novembre 1855, c'est-à-dire, *cinq ans et neuf mois après la découverte du tableau*, l'évidence surabonde que s'il vit le dessin en 1835, il ne le remarqua pas ; de plus, qu'il demeura sans soupçonner même son existence, jusqu'à ce que, quinze années plus tard, la splendeur naissante du tableau vint en illuminer l'obscurité ; par conséquent, que sa « conviction » de 1858 est une *conviction pour l'occasion*. Si délicate est la fibre des « éminents » Germains, « supérieurs » *Par Autorité* « à tout Anglais » !

Peu de jours après que j'eusse vu les photographies en question, une personne de ma connaissance, désirant en acheter quelques-unes, vint chez moi avec une collection complète pour que je l'assistasse dans son choix. Je lui demandai s'il avait remarqué ce que le catalogue disait de l'*Apollon et Marsyas*. — « Oui certes, répondit-il, et j'en ai été frappé : d'où vient ce nom de Mantegna ? — C'est la griffe du prince Albert, repris-je. — Après une pause, il me dit : — « Vous avez raison ! Je sors de chez Bardi ; lui-même m'a confié cette collection que vous voyez et m'a appris que le prince Albert lui avait procuré les autorisations nécessaires à l'exécution de cet ouvrage qui se publiait sous le patronage du prince et sa *surveillance*. Bardi loge à l'hôtel Byron, rue Laffitte. » Jusqu'à ce moment j'avais ignoré que Bardi fût à Paris. Une *légitime défense* alors, pour ne pas parler de motifs plus élevés, me poussait à approfondir cette nouvelle perfidie.

Prenant avec moi le Catalogue Selvatico, j'allai à l'hôtel Byron. C'était le mardi-gras, 8 mars; Bardi était chez lui, et, comme c'était fête, de loisir. Je demandai à voir ses photographies. Comme il ne demandait pas de nom, je n'en donnai point. Il avait différé son retour à Florence expressément pour surveiller la première issue de sa publication ici; il avait donc à cœur de la montrer, et de satisfaire aux informations. Je commençai par la *Première Série*, celle de Florence; j'examinai chaque pièce, et signalai plusieurs erreurs dans le catalogue. Il me remercia de mes corrections, et les mit en note avec empressement. Arrivé à la *Seconde Série*, je lus la note à haute voix, et remarquai que faire parade dans une œuvre italienne d'un nom allemand éventé même en Allemagne, c'était faire tort à l'Italie, et qu'en tout cas l'un ou l'autre pays aurait pu lui fournir une autorité plus respectable que ce M. Passavant, insignifiant comme critique, et indigne de confiance comme homme. — « Oh ! dit il, ce n'est pas ma faute. Je ne suis pas connaisseur. C'est le prince Albert qui a obtenu des gouvernements autrichien et toscan la permission d'exécuter ces photographies. Pour les dessins de Vienne et de Venise, il me donna une lettre pour l'archiduc Ferdinand-Maximilien, auquel je la présentai moi-même à Scöhnbrunn, et m'ordonna, par son secrétaire allemand, le docteur Becker, de m'en tenir à MM. Passavant et Selvatico pour la confection du catalogue; mais de commencer toujours par consulter M. Passavant, qu'il regardait comme la plus haute des autorités. L'ouvrage est publié sous le patronage du prince Albert, et lui est dédié. Je n'en suis rien que l'éditeur, et j'arrive de Londres où je viens de le lui soumettre achevé. » — Alors je présume

que ce catalogue a été révisé par le prince Albert avant la publication ? — « *Il l'a été* ».

Maintenant j'arrivais au n° 80, l'*Apollon et Marsyas*. — Autre erreur ! dis-je. Ce dessin est exécuté principalement à la pointe d'argent, et non à la plume, comme vous l'indiquez. Mais que veut dire cela, « *par quelques uns attribué à Mantegna* » ? Il n'a jamais été attribué à Mantegna. Voici le Catalogue de votre marquis Selvatico. Remarquez ; il le déclare « une œuvre de rare perfection, *dans laquelle Raphaël montre toute son élégance* », et « *reconnu indubitablement de Raphaël* » (1). Passavant non plus ne parle pas de Mantegna. Comment ce nom est-il venu là ? — Bardi convint alors que le Catalogue Selvatico lui était familier, et qu'il savait bien que ni dans ce catalogue, ni dans Passavant, Mantegna n'était mentionné. Mais sur ce dessin, dit-il, il y avait une singulière histoire dont il avait entendu les détails à Venise. C'était le dessin pour le tableau appartenant à M. Morris Moore à qui le prince Albert était extrêmement hostile, ce dont M. Morris Moore avait tellement souffert en Angleterre, qu'il en avait quitté le pays. A une entrevue que lui, Bardi, avait eue avec le prince Albert,

(1) L'expression « *di rara perfezione* » que M. Selvatico applique au dessin d'*Apollon et Marsyas*, se rencontre ailleurs, quoique avec beaucoup moins de raison, dans son catalogue, comme aussi les phrases analogues « *di rara bellezza* », « *bel disegno franchissimo* », etc. Elles sont toutes, « *par Permission* », dûment rendues en anglais par « *d'une singulière beauté* », « *très-beau* », « *beau et très-hardi dessin* », etc. Mais le panégyrique du dessin d'*Apollon et Marsyas*, « *Opera di rara perfezione in cui Raffaello mostra tutta la sua eleganza* », n'étant pas, par exception, inclus dans le brevet royal, est *par conséquent supprimé*.

Où tout respire l'ingénuité, pas un mot qui ne soit précieux. La série de Venise est distinguée des autres, comme nous l'avons vu page 24, par cette annonce que « les photographies des Dessins de cette série sont toutes de la

celui-ci avait repoussé avec véhémence le dessin, et aussi, — sans l'avoir jamais vu, — le tableau, comme n'étant ni l'un ni l'autre de Raphaël. L'interpolation anonyme de Mantegna avait été insérée par l'ordre formel du prince Albert. — Je ne suis pas le seul dans Paris à qui Bardi ait raconté ces particularités. Mais qu'est-il besoin de témoins ? Voici le *corpus delicti*, — le mensonge dans le catalogue et la *dédicace*. Avant de me retirer, j'obtins deux versions du catalogue, une en italien, l'autre en anglais « Dédicée par Permission à S. A. R. le Prince-Epoux ».

L'adulation porte profit : on nous dira que la publication étant *la chose* du prince Albert, il peut l'accommoder à sa fantaisie ; que lui aussi, tout comme un autre, doit avoir la liberté d'exprimer une opinion, et que l'interpolation n'a pas besoin d'autre apologie. La première proposition est trop escarpée pour une réponse ; l'autre est moins inabordable. Que tout homme ait la liberté de s'exprimer librement sur toute matière, et que l'honneur soit le seul frein à la licence ! Mais sous le masque, insinuer dans un document public une assertion maligne, aussi dénuée de conviction que de vérité, préjudiciable à notre voisin, présentée comme la décision respectable d'une grave autorité, —

même grandeur que les originaux ». Or les figures dans le dessin d'*Apollon et Marsyas* sont exactement de la même grandeur que dans le tableau, et une empreinte sur les contours du dessin montre qu'elles ont été transportées sur le parneau par le décalque. La publication « Dédicée par Permission, etc. », dispose d'une telle connexion entre les deux ouvrages, en donnant franchement, sous le couvert de l'annonce précitée, une photographie de ce dessin ainsi réduite, qu'elle représente l'*Apollon plus petit d'un pouce et trois quarts* — la hauteur de la tête et du cou — que l'*original*. Ainsi, au pis aller, le *Patron* peut se reposer sur la satisfaction d'avoir au moins prouvé que ce dessin n'eût jamais pu servir de calque *réel* aux figures du tableau.

interprétation que je défie la *casuistie* elle-même de repousser, — est une extension du principe difficilement conciliable avec aucun système reçu de morale. Le silence sur l'abstention complète de M. Passavant, l'interpolation subreptice d'un plein démenti à la déclaration de Selvatico, l'entièbre suppression de celle-ci, sont de dignes corolaires de cette sorte *d'arguments* lachés sur moi pour revendiquer les « qualifications » superlatives de cette « main habile »⁽¹⁾, de ce fonctionnaire *deux fois chassé, confesseur de sa propre incompétence*, M. Eastlake, —

(1) Voir l'Appendice du prince Albert au Rapport du Comité Parlementaire de 1853 sur la Galerie Nationale (n° XVII, p. 791), et sa Lettre à lord Ellesmere sur l'Exposition de Manchester, dans les journaux de Londres de juillet 1858.

Il convient qu'il soit bien compris que cette « main habile » vit *l'Apollon et Marsyas* exposé pour la vente chez Christie en 1850. Quatre personnes de ma connaissance, témoins du fait, me l'ont fréquemment répété, à moi et à d'autres. L'une d'elles, M. J. W. Brett de Hanover Square, lui *signalà* même *l'Apollon et Marsyas* comme une œuvre remarquable. La « main habile » le regarda, murmura quelque chose comme « curieux », et — passa outre. Ceci vient expliquer les intrigues qui suivirent contre le tableau et le dessin. Liés comme sont ces deux ouvrages à la réputation d'un homme qui a contribué pour sa part à chasser deux fois de la Galerie Nationale le client du prince, la « main habile » et son Patron ont évidemment un intérêt à les miner.

Ce fut encore la même « main habile » qui, en 1845, évalua à 15,750 francs et acheta pour cette somme le faux Holbein, un « *Medical Gentleman* », comme il le nomme, et qui en même temps repoussa pour 12,500 francs le tableau inachevé de l'Exposition de Manchester, *La Vierge et l'Enfant avec Saint Jean et des Saints* par Michel-Ange : *méprise* dont je fis un point capital de mon acte d'accusation devant le Comité Parlementaire de 1853 (Quest. 9953) sur la Galerie Nationale.

Ainsi sous les yeux de ce chef d'une galerie nationale frauduleusement réinstallé deux fois, de ce président d'une académie royale, ont passé, même alors qu'on avait excité sur eux son attention, deux des plus rares et des plus exquis spécimens de la Renaissance; mais lui pour eux fut sans yeux, eux pour lui furent des pages vides : étrange, mais authentique abrégé de sa carrière officielle. — Voir THE REJECTED MICHAEL ANGELO, Appendix, page 57.

Le Chevalier, de par sa carte, — et pour garantir cet « aimable, distingué et tout-à-fait gentleman » de servir de « plastron aux attaques de chaque compétiteur désappointé ».

Rentré chez moi, je fis un mémoire de ce qui s'était passé chez Bardi, et j'examinai la version « Dédiee *par Permission*, etc. ». Elle commençait par la série de Venise; la note était la même; mais au n° 80, je découvris une *addition*:

« 80. APOLLON ET MARSYAS : dessin à la plume, ombré à l'encre de Chine. Ce dessin a été attribué à Mantegna; il « correspond au tableau appartenant aujourd'hui à M. Morris « Moore. »

Pourquoi s'arrêter? Pourquoi gauchir à proclamer que, en 1850, le commissaire-priseur catalogua le *tableau* aussi comme Mantegna? L'attribution du *dessin* à Mantegna en 1859 devait signaler *une coïncidence*. Pourquoi laisser indécise une conclusion si infinie contre « le tableau appartenant aujourd'hui à M. Morris Moore? » Mais quand la fourbe ne fut-elle pas lâche? Avoir cité *loyalement* le mémorandum de Cicognara portait son propre antidote, puisque la curieuse petite gravure de Benedetto Montagna, *Apollon et Marsyas*, avec Apollon en blouse jouant du rebec, se peut voir dans toute importante collection de gravures, et ne « correspond » ni au catalogue de la vente en 1850, ni « au tableau appartenant aujourd'hui à M. Morris Moore ». Des pieds à la tête, sous quelque côté qu'on la tourne, l'interpolation est une fourberie. Pas un nom décent ne peut être produit pour lui prêter une contenance. Je vais au devant de l'apologie de

l'addition anglaise. L'imprimeur sera le coupable. Un *a* pour un *o*, un *e* pour un *a*, et voyez le Benedetto Montagna de Cicognara devenir *innocemment* Andrea Mantegna, le nom pour un moment attaché au tableau. Regardez la coïncidence! En attendant, comme un « venimeux reptile », le faux serpente par l'Europe, et ainsi, dans le calcul probable des chances, l'espérance fermenté que le venin laissera des traces (1).

Il y a neuf années que dure cette conspiration, nourrie de toutes les turpitudes. Aveuglés par l'ignorance et de pervers instincts, les conspirateurs saluèrent dans l'*Apollon et Marsyas* une opportunité. Il pouvait remettre toutes les transgressions. Mon jugement en défaut ici, le verdict que deux fois j'avais établi contre eux était renversé, une réinstallation frauduleuse absoute. Belle perspective au travers d'un triste raisonnement. Ils se mirent à l'œuvre; mais comme les taupes, sous terre. Quand je me mis à les déterrer, une obséquieuse franc-maçonnerie, par déférence pour un étranger que cependant chacun à part soi vitupère, m'obstrua tous les abords de la publicité, étouffa ma parole là où déjà ma voix avait été sollicitée et applaudie. Tel fut le salaire de l'énergie de mes meilleures années dévouées au public; telle, la *conséquence* de cette masse de témoignages que, en dépit de l'adulation, j'avais reçus de la presse et des hommes de quelque

(1) J'ai résolu, puisque toute loyauté semble éteinte en Angleterre, de répandre par l'Europe, en diverses langues, chaque incident de cette ignoble conspiration; d'afficher le nom de quiconque l'appuie. C'est un Dr Radford, de Suffolk-Street, Pall Mall, Londres, qui « par pur amour de l'Art », comme il le donne à entendre, s'est offert comme traducteur « honoraire » et correcteur juré du catalogue du prince Albert.

conscience, et, titres autrement flatteurs, des confessions arrachées à l'ennemi. Mais « la vérité défiant tous les calculs est la vérité ». Je m'avais qu'e l'Angleterre n'était pas le *Monde*, et, secouant la poussière de mes pieds, j'en appela à l'Europe. Le nouveau verdict a plus que ratifié l'ancien.

Chez *moi*, les personnalités sont un démerite qui l'emporte sur l'argument et *déréalise* le fait. Encore faut-il pourtant que je continue à m'en servir, jusqu'à ce que j'aie appris que des mesures puissent prendre naissance sans un homme, un acte sans un agent, la fraude sans un fourbe. Mais, Dieu merci ! je sens en moi ce qui doit me préserver toujours de me livrer à *des personnalités telles que celle qu'on vient de prouver ici*. Pas un homme dans le parlement anglais, où même le plus mince prétexte pour crier à l'« honneur national » est tout aussitôt saisi comme atout, n'a jamais hasardé un souffle sur mon arrestation à Berlin, un souffle sur cette audacieuse violation de la loi internationale, mon expulsion de la Prusse au mépris du plus complet aveu du gouvernement prussien que rien jamais n'avait pu motiver l'un ou l'autre outrage. Mais « de ce silence on peut entendre autant que de la langue de crêcelle d'une éloquence effrontée », et « c'est merveille que l'instinct. » La pièce de Berlin fut remise à l'étude pour une reprise à Paris ; mais les sympathies germanines d'une cour Germaine firent défaut à l'entreprise (1).

(1) Il est notoire à Berlin que l'ordre de mon arrestation émanea *directement du cabinet du roi*, et que le chef de la police ignora le projet jusqu'après la perpétration de l'outrage.

Combien d'Anglais oseront exprimer *ouvertement* ce que même le plus vil *ne pourra s'empêcher de sentir* à la lecture de ceci? Où de telles choses que j'ai souffertes peuvent passer sans réclamation, le civisme n'est qu'un son, la liberté qu'un fantôme. Que peut de plus le despotisme le plus féroce, qu'étrangler? La liberté! — en Angleterre la servilité est son vampire. Qu'un Anglais, « né libre », comme tous en ont plein la bouche, ose autant! — mon expérience l'attend. Dans la seule bassesse est la sécurité.

Signé, MORRIS MOORE.

POSTSCRIPTUM

Le nouvel épisode du complot contre moi au sujet du dessin d'*Apollon et Marsyas* n'a rencontré à Paris que le mépris et la déroute. Les Français sont chatouilleux : ils l'appellent rondement « *une infamie* ». Son seul terroir aujourd'hui est l'Angleterre. Là, au milieu des rires serviles à des fadaises de cuistre d'école sur les « hypothèses » et les « contingences », étalées en réponse à une simple question⁽¹⁾; parmi les sarcasmes plus serviles encore à l'adresse du « *fameux tableau* appartenant aujourd'hui à Morris Moore, — *Esquire* »; là seulement, l'expérience me dit qu'il peut vivre. Mais la plate vulgarité n'empêchera pas ce même « *fameux tableau* » de briller comme vraiment fameux, même parmi les plus fameux tableaux, longtemps après que le « *fameux auteur* », le

(1) Voir la réponse de M. Disraeli à M. Coningham. — *Débats parlementaires* du 25 mars 1859.

« fameux » *orateur débitant les périodes d'autrui* (1), le « fameux » *homme d'état* de sang-azur oriental, Disraeli-Benjamin-le-Très-Honorables, se sera pavané, avec la cohue de même espèce, jusque dans un misérieordieux oubli.

J'ai dit que la fourbe était lâche. Les conspirateurs se sont dérobés à leur besogne. Le catalogue du prince Albert, significativement corrigé, a été publié en français. Le « Dédié par Permission, etc., » est par « Permission » disparu,—par « Permission » dé-Dédié; disparus aussi, par « Permission », sont Passavant et Selvatico. Leurs noms étaient de petite recommandation à Paris. La note qui les contenait est écourtée à ce déguisement, que « les photographies des Dessins de cette Série sont tous de la même grandeur que les originaux », bagage oublié peut-être dans le tumulte de la retraite. Mais ce ne sont pas là toutes les expurgations.

« Par suite des fréquentes réclamations qui lui ont été adressés ici à ce sujet », affirme M. Bardì, mais non moins sans doute *par suite du manque d'appuis*, le dessin d'*Apollon et Marsyas* n'est pas, par « Permission », pour plus longtemps « attribué par quelques-uns à Mantegna », mais de même que ses compagnons, il triomphe par « Permission » comme *Raphaël*, avec l'adjonction de la note aujourd'hui bénigne, que « il correspond au tableau appartenant à M. Morris Moore ».

Ci-jointe une lettre, servant de complément à cet EXPOSÉ, et de certificat à mes prétentions comme prophète. (Voir page 21 la lettre de M. Léon BATTÉ).

(1) Comparer le panégyrique du maréchal Bugeaud par M. Thiers, et celui du duc de Wellington par M. Disraeli.

APPENDIX

ARTICOLO

DEL

CORRIERE ITALIANO DI VIENNA

DI MERCOLEDÌ 13 MAGGIO 1857

Riprodotto sul MONITORE TOSCANO

GIOVEDÌ 4 GIUGNO DEL MEDESIMO ANNO.

APOLLO E MARSIA

UN DIPINTO ED UN DISEGNO DI RAFFAELLO

Il signor Morris Moore, uomo ben conosciuto in fatto di Belle Arti, il quale trascorse gran parte di sua vita a percorrere musei, gallerie e città ricche in monumenti, scoperse a Londra, alcuni anni or sono, un insigne dipinto di Raffaello, rappresentante Apollo e Marsia. Non andò guari ch' ei seppe esistere fra li disegni appartenuti al pittore Bossi, ed acquistati dalla munificenza sovrana, e da questa donati alla nostra Accademia, un disegno originale colla precisa composizione di Raffaello, sotto il quale, di mano del Cicognara, era stato scritto *di Benedetto Montagna*, tratto forse in errore quell' egregio, dall' avere appunto Benedetto, e non Bartolommeo, come poscia fu detto, intagliato il soggetto medesimo; quando lo stile e la scuola affatto diversc, lo palesavano opera esimia dell' Urbinate.

Per confrontar dunque il dipinto col disegno, fin dal marzo 1854, cercò modo il Morris Moore di possedere una fotografia del secondo, e per ciò col mezzo del signor Edoardo Cheney, pregava il sig. Rawdon Browne, che da più anni onora di sua dimora Venezia, a procurargliela. Ad onta però delle sollecitudini prese dal signor Browne, non fu possibile ad esso di averla, essendogli stata negata dal segretario della R. Accademia, sig. M. Selvatico, e ciò per ignorate cagioni.

ARTICLE

FROM THE

CORRIERE ITALIANO OF VIENNA

WEDNESDAY MAY THE 13th 1857

Republished by the MONITORE TOSCANO

THURSDAY JUNE THE 4th OF THE SAME YEAR.

APOLLO AND MARSYAS

A PAINTING AND A DRAWING BY RAPHAEL

Mr. Morris Moore, a man well known in the Fine Arts, and who has passed a great part of his life in visiting Museums, Galleries, and cities rich in monuments of Art, discovered some years ago an exquisite painting by Raphael, representing Apollo and Marsyas. Not long after, he heard that among the drawings formerly belonging to the painter Bossi, since acquired by Royal munificence and presented to our Academy, there existed an original drawing of the very same composition by Raphael, under which had been written by the hand of Ciconiara, *Benedetto Montagna*, that accomplished man having perhaps been led into error by Benedetto, and not Bartolommeo, as was subsequently said, having engraved the same subject; although the style and the school, entirely different, revealed it to be a transcendent work of Raphael.

To compare then the painting with the drawing, Morris Moore, as early as March, 1854, sought means to obtain a photograph of the latter; and he accordingly, through Mr. Edward Cheney got Mr. Rawdon Browne, who for many years has resided in Venice, to procure it for him. In spite, however, of the pains taken by Mr. Browne, it was impossible for him to obtain it, the secretary of the I. R. Academy, the Marchese Selvatico, having refused it him, and this for reasons unknown.

Due mesi appresso, cioè nel maggio 1854, il barone Marocchetti, scultore stabilito a Londra, pregato dal Morris Moore medesimo, scriveva ad un suo amico Inglese, forse il signor Leeves, residente in Venezia, di rinnovar la domanda al sig M. Selvatico, il quale questa volta rispondeva non poter permettere che tratta fosse alcuna fotografia da quel disegno, se prima non l'avesse ottenuta il Direttore della Galleria Nationale Inglese, signor Eastlake, « *col quale erasi impegnato* »; ma che tosto dopo ne riceverebbe una copia. Ma non si verificò mai l'opera della fotografia, e quindi neppur la promessa. Sembra adunque che l'impedimento per ottenerlo derivasse dall' *Eastlake*.

Pochi di appresso di questo ultimo fatto, il signor Giuseppe D. Böhm, Direttore dell' I. R. Accademia degli incisori di Zecca, ed I. R. incisore di camera a Vienna, conosceitore espertissimo di Belle Arti e già possessore di disegni originali di Raffaello, recandosi per ordini dell' Imperiale governo in Italia, affine di esaminare lo stato del Cenaeolo di Leonardo e di altri celebrati dipinti, colse quella occasione per vedere il disegno in parola, conoscendo già per fama il dipinto posseduto dal Morris Moore; ma quel disegno era stato tolto dalla cornice, e perchè lo vedesse si trasse da una custodia della stanza del segretario. Chiese allora il signor Böhm al marchese Selvatico di mandargliene una fotografia, « *ma ad onta delle più positive sue promesse non la potè mai avere* », come egli stesso con queste precise parole, scriveva al Morris Moore da Vienna il 22 luglio 1855, la lettera del quale veniva pubblicata il 1 del seguente settembre nei giornali Inglesi. Nè solamente si levò dalla cornice il disegno in questione, ma s' impedi che fosse veduto da alcuni intelligenti forestieri, siccome testimoniar possono li sigg. Guglielmo Smith, già negoziante di stampe a Londra, e Guglielmo Carpenter, capo del dipartimento delle Incisioni e Stampe nel Museo Britannico, i quali venuti nell'

Two months afterwards, that is, in May, 1854, Baron M^rrocchetti, a sculptor established in London, wrote at the instance of Morris Moore himself to an English friend resident at Venice, perhaps Mr. Leeves, to renew the request to the sig. M^r Selvatico, who this time replied that he could allow no photograph of that drawing to be taken until the Director of the English National Gallery, Mr. Eastlake, “*to whom he stood thus pledged*”, had first received one; but that soon after he should have a copy. But the execution of the photograph was never realised, and consequently, neither was the promise. It appears, therefore, that the impediment to obtaining it derived from *Eastlake*.

A few days after this last occurrence, M. Joseph D. Böhm, Director of the I. R. Academy of the Medallists of the Mint, and I. R. Medallist in Ordinary at Vienna, a most able connoisseur and formerly possessor of original drawings by Raphael, having come to Italy by command of the Imperial Government in order to examine the condition of the *Cenacolo*, by Leonardo, and of other celebrated paintings, seized that opportunity to see the drawing in question, he being already acquainted by fame with the painting in Morris Moore’s possession; but that drawing had been removed from its frame, and it had to be fetched from the private room of the secretary (Selvatico) before he could see it. M. Böhm then asked the Marchese Selvatico to send him a photograph of it; but “*in spite of his (Selvatico’s) most positive promises, he could never get it*”, as he himself, in these same words, wrote to Morris Moore, on the 22nd of July, 1855, in a letter which was published on the 1st of the September following, in the English journals (1). Nor was the drawing in question merely taken from its frame, but various foreigners were prevented even from seeing it, as can testify Messieurs William Smith, late printseller of London, and William Carpenter, keeper of the

autunno dell' anno 1854 in Venezia, e qui fermatisi quattro giorni, non fu loro possibile, per quanto fecero, di veder quel disegno, negato loro quando sotto d'uno, quando sotto l'altro pretesto. Il Smith pure intese a Venezia, come egli stesso riferì a Morris Moore allorchè fu di ritorno a Londra, che sarebbe inutile pensare alla fotografia, e ehe l'impedimento derivasse dal soprannominato *Eastlake*.

Il riconoscimento poi di quel disegno per parte dell'onorevole ed intelligentissimo sig. Böhm, accaduto come si disse nel maggio 1854, valse sì che allora soltanto, e non prima, fosse valutato di Raffaello, e non del Benedetto Montagna, e fu allora che il M. Selvatico, valendosi di quel riconoscimento, pubblicava nel catalogo dei disegni antichi esistenti nella R. Accademia Veneta di Belle Arti dato fuori il 31 luglio di quell'anno, ed essere stato esso disegno « *riconosciuto indubitamente di Raffaello* », e possederne il signor Morris Moore un dipinto dell'autore stesso, senza accennare aversi allora corretto soltanto, a merito del Morris Moore e del Böhm, lo sbaglio commesso dal Cicognara; anzi, in quella vece, incorse egli in due altri errori rilevantissimi, e sono; il primo, nell'asserire essersi attribuito quel disegno a *Bartolomeo Montagna* in luogo di *Benedetto*, il quale intagliò quel soggetto, come si disse, e come fu scritto dal Cicognara; il secondo, nell'aver affermato essere il dipinto di Raffaello posseduto dal Morris Moore, *un poco più piccolo del disegno*, quando è, in vece, maggiore in altezza di circa tre oncie, ed in larghezza di circa un' oncia.

Conviene notare che all' Eastlake premeva che fosse ignorato questo disegno di Raffaello, perchè per tale guisa pensava impedire che maggior nome acquistasse in fatto di cognizioni artistiche il Morris Moore medesimo, il quale aveva due volte operato per mezzo del Parlamento, cioè nel 1847 e nel 1854.

Prints and Drawings in the British Museum, who having come to Venice in the autumn of 1854, and remained here four days, found it impossible, notwithstanding all their efforts, to see that drawing, access to it having been denied them on one pretext or another. Mr. Smith also heard in Venice, as he himself on his return to London informed Morris Moore, that it would be useless to think of the photograph, and that the impediment derived from the above-named *Eastlake*.

The recognition of this drawing by the honourable and most intelligent M. Böhm, which occurred, as we have said, in May, 1854, was of such weight, that then only, and not before, was it re-established as being by Raphael, and not by Benedetto Montagna; and it was now that the M^e Selvatico availing himself of that recognition, published in the Catalogue of Drawings existing in the I. Venetian Academy of Fine Arts, brought out on the 31st of July of that same year, both that the drawing had been “*ascertained to be undoubtedly by Raphael*”, and that Mr. Morris Moore possessed a painting of it by the same master, but without mentioning that the mistake committed by Cieognara had now been corrected only through Morris Moore and Böhm ; nay, he fell instead into two other very considerable errors; namely, the first, in asserting that that drawing had been attributed to *Bartolommeo Montagna*, in place of *Benedetto*, who engraved that subject, as has been said, and as was written by Cieognara; the second, in having asserted the painting belonging to Morris Moore, to be *a little smaller than the drawing*, when, on the contrary, it is larger in height by about three inches, and in breadth by about one inch.

It is necessary to observe here that it was of great consequence to Eastlake that this drawing by Raphael should remain unknown. On account of his vandalisms in the treatment of Ancient Paintings and his ignorant purchases, Morris Moore had twice, by means of Parliament, effected his removal from

che rimosso venisse, per eagine di vandalismo in fatto di ristauri di antiehi dipinti e di ignorantia aequisti, dal Direttorato della Galleria Nazionale Inglese, nuovamente da lui oceupato poseia per quegli intrighi noti a tutta l'Inghilterra. Feee l'Eastlake in persona due viaggi da Londra a Venezia, eioè nel 1852 e nel 1854, espressamente per impegnare il Selvatico come di sopra aeeennato. In quanto agli ignorantia aequisti fatti dall' Eastlake per la Galleria Nazionale Inglese, basta dire che aleuni da esso e da un tal Mündler bavarese fatti in Italia nei due ultimi anni, vennero per ordine superiore rivenduti all'Asta pubblica il 14 del febbraio decorso. La somma ricavata fu meno della metà del loro costo.

Nello scorso gennaio recandosi a Venezia da Londra il signor Alessandro Barker, e volendo ottenere una fotografia del disegno in questione, a eiò sollecitato dal Morris Moore, non fu possibile a lui di mandare ad effetto il desiderio, appunto per la negativa che ebbe dal M. Selvatico. Il che viene a confermare più aneora le cose superiormente esposte, e mostra il deliberato consiglio di nascendere per aleune viste quel disegno.

Prima però di questo ultimo fatto, eioè nel 1856, aveva il Morris Moore interposto, per mezzo dei signori Higgins e Dawkins di Londra, il signor Harris console generale Inglese in Venezia, affine di ottenergli la sospirata fotografia, ed egli, valendosi dei propri mezzi, fe' sì che quella volta non potesse essere a lui negata. Ma aeeadde però, che chiamatosi un' artista ignorante o prevenuto, non potè questi, o disse di non poter trarre la fotografia riecreata; e sì che il marchese Selvatico propose al signor Harris, di farne eseguire, in quella veee, la copia in disegno, da un giovane studente dell' Accademia; e questa copia si spedì al possessore del quadro in Ingilterra.

the Directorship of the English National Gallery (in 1847 and 1854), subsequently again occupied by him through those intrigues which are notorious to all England. By the concealment therefore of the drawing, he hoped to prevent Morris Moore from acquiring greater authority in matters of Art. Eastlake made two journeys in person from London to Venice, namely, in 1852 and 1854, expressly to gain over Selvatico, as above mentioned. With regard to the ignorant purchases made by Eastlake for the English National Gallery, it is enough to record that some made within the two last years in Italy by him and one Mündler, a Bavarian, were resold on the 14th of last February (1857) by public auction, and that the sum realised for them was less than half their cost.

Last January (1857) Mr. Alexander Barker having arrived at Venice from London, and wishing to obtain a photograph of the drawing in question, to this solicited by Morris Moore, he found it impossible to accomplish his desire, and precisely on account of the refusal which he met with from the M^e Selvatico. All which comes to confirm still further the things above set forth, and shews the deliberate intention to conceal, for some motive, that drawing.

Before this last occurrence however, that is, in 1856, Morris Moore having, in order to obtain the desired photograph, interposed by means of Messieurs Higgins and Dawkins of London, Mr. Harris, the English consul-general in Venice, the latter so managed that this time it could not be refused. But it now befell, that the photographer engaged (by Selvatico) being either ignorant or so instructed, could not, or said he could not, produce the required photograph; and thus the M^e Selvatico proposed to Mr. Harris to have executed, in its stead, a copy in drawing by a young student of the Academy, and this copy was forwarded to the possessor of the picture in England.

Tutte le particolarità notate ed altre ancora infinite, si pubblicarono in parecchi giornali, e sembrando impossibile il non potersi cavare da quel disegno una fotografia, mosse M. Passavant, Direttore della Galleria di Francoforte sul Meno, a ricerarne a Venezia la causa. Ricevette in risposta, dipendere l' impossibilità dal fatto, che l' originale disegno è eseguito sopra carta di tinta rossa ; tinta, la quale per il fotografo risponde, come si voleva far credere, a perfetta oscurità. Quella ricerca, e la risposta che la seguì vennero pubblicate il 1 novembre 1855, dal Passavant medesimo, nel giornale Berlinese di Belle Arti intitolato *Deutsches Kunstblatt*.

Non è da dirsi quindi di quale e quanta indignazione fosse preso il detto signor Morris Moore nel vedre tante contraddizioni, tanti errori, tante sorgere questioni e basse gare, affine di velare le male arti esercitate contro di lui ; e perciò trè articoli pubblicava in vari giornali Inglesi, nell' agosto 1855 e nel maggio 1856, nei quali lagnavasi di tutti coloro che avevano dapprima quasi tentato nascondere il disegno, poi non potendo in ciò riuscire, impedito che fosse reso noto mediante la fotografia.

Se non che risposto avendosi a quegli articoli, nel giornale l' *Examiner* in data 7 giugno 1856, in modo da far credere essere calunnie le cose esposte dal Morris Moore, svisando, o meglio *falsando* i fatti da lui resi noti quando quei fatti erano suffulti da documenti inopponibili, fecesi egli a smascherare quelle falsità in un articolo pubblicato nel giornale privilegiato di Berlino intitolato *Vossische Zeitung*, in data 13 febbraio decorso ; e per vederla una volta finita, recòssi egli stesso a Vienna affine di ottenere dal supremo Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, un regolare permesso per poter trarre dal combattuto disegno la fotografia dichiarata *impossibile*. Ed egli infatti l' ottenne tostamente ; e la ottenne con quella liberalità

All the particulars above recorded, besides very many others, were published in several journals, and it seeming unaccountable that no photograph could be produced from that drawing, M. Passavant, the Director of the Gallery of Frankfort-on-the-Maine, undertook to inquire at Venice the cause. He heard in reply, that the impossibility arose from the fact that the original drawing is executed on paper of a red tint; a tint which to the photographer corresponds, as it was sought to make believe, to perfect darkness. That inquiry and the answer which followed it, were published by Passavant himself on the 1st of November, 1855, in the Berlinean Art-Journal entitled, *Deutsches Kunstblatt*.

It were needless to tell how great was now Mr. Morris Moore's indignation on discovering so many contradictions, so many blunders, so many subterfuges and base intrigues, in order to cloak the malignant artifices employed against him; and he therefore in August, 1855, and May, 1856, published in various English journals, three articles in which he complained of all those who, at first, had attempted to conceal, at it were, that drawing; and then, not being able to succeed in this, had prevented its being made known by means of photography.

In consequence of a reply to those articles in the *Examiner* newspaper on the 7th of June, 1856, distorting, or rather, *falsifying* the facts by him made public, in a way to make them appear calumnies, although those facts were backed by irrefragable evidence (2), Morris Moore bent himself to unmask those falsehoods in an article published in the *Koniglich privilegirte Berlinische Zeitung*, called also the *Vossische Zeitung*, of the 13th of last February (1857); and to see the matter settled once for all, he went himself to Vienna, in order to obtain from the supreme Ministry of Public Instruction a regular permission to take from the disputed drawing, the photograph declared *impossible*. And indeed he obtained it speedily; and it was granted him with the liberality characteristic of the Austrian government, which loves and takes pains to foster study, to dif-

propria del governo Austriaco, il quale ama e cura di sorreggere gli studi, diffondere le istituzioni, promuovere il bene, premiare gl' ingegni; ed era quindi il Morris Moore munito di largo decreto, col quale mettevasi in grado, e di levare liberamente l' agognata fotografia e di trarne altre, se lo avesse creduto, dai disegni posseduti dalla Veneta Accademia, i quali potessero venire in soccorso dei di lui studii.

Giunto l' onorevole signor Morris Moore a Venezia, trovò aperta ai suoi desiderii la R. Accademia, assente il signor Selvatico, dal signor Tagliapietra; e condottovi seco l' esperto fotografo signor Perini, tostamente, e con tutto l' esito, cavò la fotografia antecedentemente annunziata per *impossibile*, e così esso eziandio ne trasse un' altra, da un altro disegno di Raffaello, in cui si scorge aver quel sommo tracciato il primo pensiero, o meglio le forme d'Apollo, di cui poi se ne valse nel dipinto di Apollo e Marsia, dal Morris Moore posseduto.

Queste cose volemmo render palesi per molti riguardi, quelli cioè, di smentire le favole promulgate da parecchi giornali stranieri; di svelare le arti usate da chi amava che quel disegno fosse, per secondi fini, ignorato; di dimostrare l'ignoranza di aleuni che vogliono far credersi maestri in Arte, quando dell' Arte non sanno nemmeno i principii; di rendere maggiormente noto il disegno, veramente insigne di Raffaello posseduto dalla Veneta Accademia, il quale deve agli studii ed alle ricerche del Morris Moore il suo riconoscimento; in fine, di offrire un tributo di grazie doverose e solenni all' Eccelso Ministero che volle con liberale animo acconsentire che se ne traesse quella fotografia, senza la quale nè si sarebbe potuto smentire i giornalisti bugiardi e gl' ignoranti; nè si sarebbe diffuso un originale preziosissimo, a vantaggio della storia e delle Arti gentili, la di cui fotografia già deposta dal Morris Moore nella R. Accademia Veneta, potrà ivi vedersi.

fuse public Institutions, to promote what is good, and to reward genius; and hence Morris Moore was furnished with an ample decree which placed him in a position to obtain freely the coveted photograph, and to take others also, had he thought fit, from such drawings belonging to the Venetian Academy as might come in aid of his studies.

Arrived at Venice, Mr. Morris Moore found the I. R. Academy made accessible to all his desires, by signor Andrea Tagliapietra, the M^e Selvatico being absent; and having brought there with him the skillful photographer signor Perini, he quickly obtained, and with complete success, the photograph previously announced as *impossible*; and, in like manner, he took also another photograph from another drawing by Raphael, in which one perceives that the incomparable master had traced the first idea, or rather the forms of the Apollo, of which he availed himself for the painting of *Apollo and Marsyas* in the possession of Morris Moore.

These things we wished to make public for many reasons; as for instance, to give the lie to the fables promulgated by certain foreign journals; to unmask the artifices practised by those who, to serve their own ends, wished that drawing to remain unknown; to demonstrate the ignorance of some who would pass themselves off as masters in Art, when of Art they know not even the rudiments; to make more widely known the truly exquisite drawing of Raphael belonging to the Venetian Academy, which to the studies and researches of Morris Moore owes its recognition; lastly, to offer a tribute of deserved and solemn thanks to the illustrious Ministry which with liberal mind was pleased to consent that that photograph should be taken, without which, neither had it been possible to give the lie to mendacious journalists, nor to the ignorant; nor to the advantage of history and of the polite Arts had been spread the knowledge of a most precious original, the photograph of which together with one from the picture, already deposited by Morris Moore in the I. R. Academy of Venice can there be seen.

NOTES TO THE CORRIERE ITALIANO, ETC.

(1) *Morning Advertiser*, September the 1st, and *Bell's Weekly Messenger*, September the 8th, 1855. The following is Director Bohm's letter:

» Vienna, li 22 Luglio, 1855.

» Pregiatissimo Signore,

» Sulla di Lei domanda se sia genuino il disegno di Raffaello, che trovasi nella raccolta dell' Accademia delle Belle Arti di Venezia, del quale ella possiede un dipinto di cui mi mandò un' intaglio in legno, ho l'onore di dichiararle che senza dubbio lo ritengo tale. Quel disegno è severo nelle forme e dell' età giovanile di Raffaello: vi si vede ancora l'influenza di Perugino, ma nel medesimo tempo una tendenza ad emanciparsi dalla maniera solita ed invariabile del maestro, in ricerca del Bello e del Sublime.

» Ho pregato verbalmente ed in iscritto il signor marchese Selvatico perchè me ne mandasse una fotografia; ma *ad onta delle più positive sue promesse, non l' ho potuto avere.*

» Dispiacentissimo perciò di non potere corrispondere ai di Lei desideri che con questa mia, invece della summenzionata fotografia, mi rassegno con istima,

» Gius. DAN. BÖHM,

» Direttore dell' Accademia degli Incisori di Zecca, ed I. R. Incisore di Camera.

» *Allo stimatissimo signor Morris Moore, Soho-Square, London.* »

(2)

Mr. JOHN FORSTER

His brief endorsed *Story of a Slander*, Mr. John Forster constituted himself, *anonymously*, counsel for fraud. His exordium is a gem, and prognostic of its sequel: — “ Few sensible men acquainted with the world, ‘‘ are prone to notice coarse slanders. They become only mischievous ‘‘ when they reward their originators with any large amount of observation ‘‘ and contempt.’’ If the *theys* in this pregnant rhetorick smack of ambiguous allegiance, it was *by design*; so, if “ only ” halts at “ mischievous ” in contempt of “ when ”: by design also, was the *something* “ becoming only mischievous when rewarded with any large amount of contempt, ” veiled in Delphic mystery. The diction suits the intent; for who but the inspired shall penetrate anything’s becoming even “ only mischievous “ when rewarded with a large amount of contempt ? ” — “ A number of goats feeding on Mount Parnassus came near a place which had a deep and long perforation. The steam which issued from the hole seemed to inspire the goats, and they played and frisked about in such an uncommon manner, that the goatherd was tempted to lean over the hole, and see what mysteries the place contained. He was immediately seized with a fit of enthusiasm, *his expressions were wild and extravagant, etc.* ” Such was the origin

of the Delphic Oracle. The inspired goatherd is here to avouch it. But just now I have other use for him.

Mr. John Forster gives, text and translation, Selvatico's description of the *Apollo and Marsyas* drawing (see page 7), and comments upon it thus :

“ Yet in the face of this *unstinted recognition*, not only of the drawing, “ but of the owner of the London picture, we have this ridiculous story “ trumped up of the English Director tampering with the Venetian Director, “ and of the latter promising to do his best to suppress what he became “ straightway careful to take every means of proclaiming to the world! ”

The “ unstinted recognition ” can be computed. It was in *May*, 1854, as stated above, that Director Böhm discovered the legerdemain. At this period *there existed no Catalogue of the Drawings in the Venetian Academy*; nor till the 31st of the *July* following did the actual one see the light. The “ unstinted recognition ” then, not to say the catalogue itself, was indited to *cloak the detected conspiracy*. But hear again the subtle pleader :

“ We take up a Catalogue, drawn up by the Marchese Selvatico, and “ printed two years ago, *after the date of the alleged conspiracy*, of the “ contents of the Venetian Academy; and in the *Sala delle Sedute*, which “ contains sketches or designs open to be examined at certain hours in “ every week by any stranger, we find placed among the choice sketches “ ascribed to Raffaelle this very *Apollo and Marsyas*; and not only placed “ among them, but accompanied with a commentary calling more attention to it than to any other of the drawings. It is pointed out to visitors “ and students, by the Marchese Selvatico, as a work of rare perfection, etc.”

“ After the date of the alleged conspiracy ”! The clumsy tool lacked the wit to perceive that his case demanded a Catalogue drawn up *before* the date of his “ *alleged* ” conspiracy, and that his “ *after*, ” *circumstantiates the fraud, and casts his clients*.

Not less than eighteen times in the column and three quarters of his forged *Story of a Slander*, does this creature *slanderously give me* the lie. Mark his maudlin effrontery :

“ We regret to say it, but this passage ” — that is my true account of “ Eastlake's plots against the drawing — “ could only have been written “ from a conviction that the very unscrupulousness of its untruth would “ secure it against answer. It is not only untrue, but the absolute reverse “ of truth.”

Full eighteen times, therefore, while drawing his verbose distinctions between “ the untrue ” and “ the absolute reverse of truth, ” *himself* lied; upon which, to further teach him that *unscrupulous untruth* does *not* secure against answer, may be heaped the following :

He avers ; I. That; Director Passavant was asked by me to pronounce upon the *Apollo and Marsyas*; II. That, this gentleman expressed to me his *conviction* that it was by Raffaelle's *friend*, Timoteo Viti of Urbano, as he words it; III. That, I carriide the picture to Paris; IV. That, I sought an opinion from the authorities of the Louvre; V. That, their opinion

proved to be entirely similar to that which had been given by Director Passavant; VI. That, *certain it is*, that when an application for a photograph of the drawing was made for me to the Marchese Selvatico, through Mr. Harris, the English Consul-general in Venice, *one of the best photographers* was summoned to provide a copy; VII. That the sole reason for my not obtaining a photograph was, either because the colour of the paper, or because the faded state of the ink in which the drawing had been executed, rendered a photograph *unattainable*.

I, II, will be found disposed of in REPLIES 1, 2, of my *Address to the German Public*, published in German in the *Vossische Zeitung* of Berlin on the 13th of February, 1857, and in English, in Mr. Léon Batté's work on the *Apollo and Marsyas*; III, IV, V, at a blow, by the one fact that the picture was never in Paris until I brought it hither on the 7th of February, 1858, to rebuke English subserviency and German perfidy, but as we are upon this topic, and “the authorities of the Louvre” have now seen the *Apollo and Marsyas*, — though not till years after the date falsely asserted in his *Story of a Slander*, — I here defy Mr. John Forster, his associates, and his Patron, to persuade ANY SINGLE ONE of those authorities to publicly subscribe to “the opinion” given by Herr Passavant, or to a denial that the *APOLLO AND MARSYAS* is other than an obvious and transcendent work of RAPHAEL; VI, VII, by the successful photograph which I instantaneously obtained from the drawing at Venice in 1857, and by the more recent and more notorious one “Dedicated by Permission to H. R. H. the Prince Consort.” Yet “an unscrupulous untruth” to crown the array.

On the 7th of April, 1856, in the Debate on the National Gallery Estimates, Mr. Otway quoted the *Examiner*, with the bulk of the London press, as having denounced *Le Chevalier* Eastlake's incompetency. On the 12th, Mr. John Forster sneering at the “news-vendors' list of London journals,” denies all fellowship with it, and “should really like Mr. Otway to favour us with the page of the *Examiner* in which that journal had been found “joining in an unprovoked and ungenerous attack against an able artist and a competent critic of Art.” With the required page (*Examiner*, Dec., 6, 1846), he was at once “favoured.” He there “adopts” that indictment of mine which first drove his client from the National Gallery, pronounces it “substantially correct and not overstated”, and demands “an instant assurance and guarantee against future tamperings.” With the “page” was a demand for public atonement. *Mr. John Forster suppressed the communication.*

Personality! What! shall this inflated parasite, this well-gilt placeman through base compliances, his breath reeking with Academy dinners, “a slave whose gall coins slanders like a Mint,” charge me with slander, yet escape the brand? *Personality!* “My phrase is to the matter.” Behold how jauntily the Forster certificate of “gentleman” sits on the Marchese Selvatico, the notorious Austrian informer! — and no Italian will gainsay me — execrated by his fellow-countrymen, contemned by his employers, and therefore the fitter to be leashed with a *Passavant*, an *Eastlake*, a *Waagen* and a — *Forster*.

LETTER OF LORD ELCHO

PUBLISHED IN THE MORNING POST, JUNE THE 10TH, 1850.

"MR. MORRIS MOORE'S RAPHAEL

"*To the Editor of the Morning Post.*

"Sir,

I trust that you will be able to find a place in your columns for a few lines in explanation of the circumstances which have prevented my publicly calling the attention of the First Lord of the Treasury to Mr. Morris Moore's Raphael, in pursuance of a notice to that effect which I gave in the early part of the session. In giving that notice I had two objects in view. I was anxious, in the first place, publicly to call the attention of the Trustees of the National Gallery to the existence, or, rather, to the discovery of a work of Art, which *I, in common with most of those who have had the good fortune to see it, believe to be of great National importance*; and, in the second place, I wished to give expression to the universal feeling of dissatisfaction which prevails with regard to the management of the concerns of the National Gallery. But, inasmuch as I felt that an unseasonable discussion of these subjects would create little interest in the House of Commons, I thought it advisable to wait until the grant was moved for the current expenses of the National Gallery, which would have offered a fitting opportunity for bringing on my notice. Time has however run on; the Session is far advanced; and I am obliged to leave England before this branch of the Miscellaneous Estimates has been brought under consideration; I must, therefore, postpone the subject to another Session. Public attention has been already so fully drawn to Mr. Morris

Moore's Raphael, and public opinion has been so strongly expressed in its favour, through the medium of the press, that I would fain hope the Trustees will make a point of securing it for the National Gallery. I have no fear as to the result of their deliberations upon it, provided they do not allow their better judgments to be influenced by the criticisms of a foreign gentleman (Herr Passavant) who, on a Friday, announces, *ex cathedrâ*, that this picture, which he admits to be a *first-rate specimen of the finest period of Italian Art*, is the work of Francia, and who, on the Monday following, with equal confidence, ascribes it to Timoteo della Vite, two painters who cannot by any possibility be confounded; provided likewise that they are not guided by the opinions of those professional connoisseurs who had neither the taste, nor the feeling, to appreciate so fine a work, nor the critical knowledge which should have led them to discover, under a false name, *the master-hand of Raphael*. My own conviction is, that this picture is not only a *Raphael*, but, perhaps, *the purest and most beautiful specimen of the master in this country*. But I care not, as regards its claims upon the National Gallery, whether it be by him or not; for when a picture is *universally pronounced to be a first-rate specimen of the finest period of Italian Art*, its title to a place in our National Collection is clear and indefeasible, and it then becomes *the bounden duty of the Trustees* not to suffer so important a work to leave the country, or become the ornament of a private gallery.

“ F. CHARTERIS (Lord ELCHO).

“ 27, Chesham Street, June, 1850.”

THE REJECTED MICHAEL ANGELO

THE MANCHESTER EXHIBITION

Various reviews have of late appeared in the London journals on the unfinished painting in tempera by Michael Angelo, *The Virgin and Child with St. John and Saints*, mentioned in the note at page 14. My Statement in the *Morning Chronicle* of June the 10th, 1858, curtailed servility of a theme. But if to "sympathise with the proper pride" of one who, profiting by my absence from England, brazenly arrogated "having been the *first* to attribute *publicly* this picture to Michael Angelo," is no longer feasible, the writers of those reviews atone by silence upon *my* claims on this masterpiece; yet, save for me, they might to this hour be as ignorant of its existence, as dishonest men must ever be of its excellence.

But the impostor has other abettors. A Mr. John Harford of Blaise Castle and a Mr. John Murray of Albemarle Street swell the band; — for to parade *his* "authority" on this subject and to not mention me, is to abet him. Mr. John Harford, in a *Life of Michael Angelo*, plumes himself upon his *own* "opinion having recently been confirmed by the *high authority* of Dr. Waagen;" blandly observes that "the Doctor *most* justly observes, etc.;" and for our higher appreciation of this "*high authority*," sends us to "*Treasures of Art*, vol. 2, page 417," — published *not until 1854*, — where lies treasured what "the Doctor," in *his* turn, had found by a year's anticipation "*confirmed*" by *my* authority in the Parliamentary Report on the National Gallery of 1853. M. John Murray, in his *Quarterly Review* for April last, *consciously* the publisher of a mendacious article in support of his "*competent man of sensitive mind and nice honour*," *Le Chevalier* Eastlake, had the effrontery in April 1858, while evading allusion to me, to print in the same Periodical, that "*Dr. Waagen's* verdict on this picture had done

“ much to convince the English Public of the justice with which it
“ now bears Michael Angelo’s great name.”

Could Mr. John Harford of Blaise Castle have raised himself to the dignity of his subject, he would have felt that servility and misrepresentation ill consort with the venerable name of MICHAEL ANGELO. Had Mr. John Murray — but enough. Let him enjoy Free Trade even to the “ right ” of selling his venal pages to the most profitable bidder. In vain the servile strive to defraud Truth. I have placed my title-deeds beyond their reach.

For such Englishmen as dare be convinced that an Englishman may be worth a German (1), I reprint my Statement on THE REJECTED MICHAEL ANGELO.

Paris, June the 7th, 1858.

The Manchester display was an exposition of England’s claims in the domain of Art. Many were the pearls; but counterfeit on counterfeit exalted into masterpieces, to subserve venality or to flatter rank, and an official Catalogue crammed with the plagiarisms and empty conceits of foreign pretenders, stamping us, “ *By Authority*, ” as bald of wit as of self-respect, have suggested to the Continent an equation not soothing to our insular vanity. Our proudest boast is our chief reproach. A masterpiece for which a Demetrius might have spared a Rhodes, had been amidst us some thirty

(1) My “ anti-Germanism ” was worked with amazing industry while I was in Germany, but it is only justice to add, with barren result. *Men of sense and candour* can easily understand that my “ anti-Germanism ” is not hostility to Germans as a people, but simply to that *German coterie* which *socially, administratively, and politically*, by favour of English satellites yet meaner, sits like an *INCUBUS* on England’s manhood, spying how it may put “ Constitutional Government on its trial, ” and under an *Albert hat* extinguish every generous impulse.

years, to remain a stranger. Offered to us, pressed upon us, at a mean price, our “right men in the right place” had spurned it from our doors (2). That masterpiece becomes the note dominant of a great Art-Festival; when, lo! an Athenian from the banks of the *Spree*, vouchsafes to proclaim himself “the first” to reveal its origin; and Britain straight adores the Oracle. Patriots revel in his triumph,—as though ‘twere a very Jubilee to Englishmen for England to figure as foil to the German,—and exultingly reckon up their “hundreds who will sympathise with the proper pride he expresses in finding so many approved judges confirming *his* opinion, that the once so-called Ghirlandaio is a genuine easel picture by the pencil of Michael Angelo;” while our gay neighbours here find scope for their pleasantries in seeing us hectored for our stolidity by one whose pretensions, long since exploded in his own country, are at such a pass in this, that the Administration of the Louvre has found it necessary to purge its Catalogue of his name. In England only can he find countenance. There, indeed, he may descend unchallenged on “the *deference* with which his opinions are received by artists and friends of Art,” and on “the confidence which many are pleased to place in *him*” (3); there issue his fiat that an alien, his creature, be sent, with comely emolument and delicate opportunities, to “travel” as the personification of the artistic intelligence of the Nation; there inspire *Economists* to predicate that *his* is at once the “highest” and the cheapest of “recommendations,” and in “*deference*” to his quin-

(2) “Sir Martin Shee (P. R. A., and *ex-officio* a Trustee of the National Gallery) was decidedly against the purchase of the picture”,—i. e., the MICHAEL ANGELO. — *Eastlake's Evid.*, 1855, q. 6, 179.

(3) *Waagen's Letters*. — *Times*, July 13, 1854, and July 16, 1856.

tessential authority, to expel Englishmen from the category of the “eligible” (4).

At page 6 of a Publication bearing the modest title-page, “*The Manchester Exhibition; What to Observe. A Walk through the Art Treasures Exhibition, under the Guidance of Dr. Waagen. A Companion to the Official Catalogue. London, etc., 1857,*” may be read :

“ 107. Michael Angelo Buonarroti. *The Virgin, the Child, St. John, and Four Angels holding Scrolls.* No artist but Michael Angelo could have attained to the expression of so lofty a purity, so elevated a consciousness of divine maternity, as that displayed in the Virgin in this picture. The angel seen in profile is, too, of extraordinary beauty. All the undraped parts are modelled with the greatest knowledge. By far the rarest picture in the whole exhibition, as only one other easel picture by Michael Angelo is known to exist—that in the Tribune at Florence. Having been the first to attribute publicly this picture, previously assigned to Domenico Ghirlandaio, to Michael Angelo (Waagen, vol. 2, page 417), it gave me much satisfaction to find this denomination acknowledged by some of the first connoisseurs I met in the exhibition.”

The “lofty purity” of this morsel, largely exemplified in the assertion about the Michael Angelo at Florenee, is a dainty fit for the “hundreds who sympathise with the proper pride” of the author. That assertion is untrue. It was levelled at a work which he knew to exist, but had never seen, namely, the Michael Angelo in my possession; yet to this same work, the very picture which he so “properly prides” himself upon “having been the *first* to attribute publicly to Michael Angelo,” owes somewhat of its present

(4) See James Wilson and Cornwall Lewis on the superiority of Germans over Englishmen. Debates on the National Gallery Estimates, August 1, 1855, and July 2, 1857.

renown. The parenthetical reference points to a book not in existence till the summer, or may be the autumn, of 1854; the No. 5 of the following extract, to a list of masterpieces passed at trifling sums by a “*Board of Taste*” careful to moderate Taste to the official standard of tens of thousands for ambiguous mediocrities, accentuated occasionally by a *not ambiguous counterfeit*. The claim of priority is met thus :

“ Q. 9,953. No. 5. *The Virgin, Child, and St. John, with Saints*, “ by MICHAEL ANGELO. This great work, superior to any in the “ National Collection, was offered to the Trustees in 1844, for “ £500, at the very time when they were in treaty for that “ wretched Holbein, *A Medical Gentleman*. It belonged to a “ lady named Bonar. The two pictures were in the same room “ at the National Gallery, and at the same time. The daub was “ secured; the masterpiece rejected. The MICHAEL ANGELO was “ subsequently exhibited at the British Institution in 1847. It “ remained on sale during the whole period of Sir C. Eastlake’s “ Keepership, and was at last sold in 1849 for Mrs. Bonar, by “ Messrs. Colnaghi, for £525.” — (*Morris Moore’s Evidence on the Picture-purchasing, July 22, 1853. Report of Sel. Com. on the National Gallery of 1853*, p. 696) (5).

In the same evidence, this work is twice again affirmed to be by MICHAEL ANGELO.

It could be shown by testimony irrefragable, that in delivering this evidence, the witness did but repeat a judgment

(5) The *Quarterly Review* of July, 1857, contained an anonymous article, but of obvious parentage, claiming for *Le Chevalier Eastlake* a lively appreciation of this work. The keenness of his appreciation of Michael Angelo is illustrated in App. No. 2, p.472, and at qq. 6,178-80 of the Report of the Select Committee on the National Gallery of 1853. In the former it is proved that he exhibited this masterpiece to the Trustees on the 3rd of June, 1844, merely as a Domenico Ghirlandaio. In the latter, he first speaks of it as “ probably painted by Domenico Ghirlandaio,” and then, as positively by Ghirlandaio. He indeed names Michael Angelo, but only to repudiate him as its author.

which he had pronounced more elaborately in 1847, upon his first introduction to this masterpiece. But a judgment privately expressed was inadequate to the emergency. The claim, one of “*public*” priority, stretched to the full the claimant’s responsibility. To confute it demanded a perfect parallel. But if personal responsibility can add emphasis to the categorical, then was the evidence of 1853 indeed emphatic. It stood as climax to an indictment addressed to the grand inquest of the Nation in the teeth of a discomfited faction, and of a Committee eager to fasten upon any indiscretion of the accuser wherewith to soften the defeat of the accused. Idle were it to plead that, granted the spuriousness of the claim and the egotism of its form, — for these, who will deny? — it must have been made in ignorance, since to have run thus headlong on detection had been fatuity scarcely credible. Assertors of false claims must be held to the consequences. Wisely was it ordained that to lack candour is to lack understanding. Folly is the very root of dishonesty. There is no extenuation. The confidential ally of the chief defendant in the National Gallery inquiry of 1853, himself assailed in the Evidence, his public boastings of complete information on all matters of Art in England in general, and of my connection therewith in particular, and his actual publication, after his own peculiar fashion, of the last (6), show all but to a demonstration that the author of “*What to Observe*” could not but have been cognizant of my evidence on the MICHAEL ANGELO. I submit, moreover, — and herein I am backed by one alike eminent for critical acumen and for literary accomplishments — that the fourth sentence of his remarks bears strong internal evidence of direct plagiarism from the first of mine. The

(6) *Königlich privilegierte Berlinische Zeitung*, Nov. 30, and Dec. 14, 1856.

homage of Europe to the majesty of the work seduced him into this extravagant claim; the ephemeral nature of his pamphlet *and my absence from England*, blinded him to its detection. Thus do the weak-witted and self-seeking, while labouring to conceal their ineptitude and to overreach others, but toil at the net that is to ensnare themselves. I asserted no priority in 1853. The contemplation of the mighty Florentine stifled self-exaltation. One exception, and I assert no priority now. The spurious claim has thriven for a year. Forbearance may become desertion of Right. It was time to pluck the stolen plumage, and so remove an unmerited stigma.

MORRIS MOORE.



NOTA

Pour plus de détails sur l'APOLLON ET MARSYAS

Voir l'Ouvrage de M. LÉON BATTÉ

LE RAPHAEL DE M. MORRIS MOORE

PARIS.... ALPHONSE TARIDE, 2, rue de Marengo.

LONDRES. WILLIAM JEFFS, 15, Burlington Arcade.

